UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,834	03/25/2004	Jiun-Yao Huang	250913-1160	7950

24504   7590   03/18/2008
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.
STE 1500
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994

EXAMINER
ANDREWS, LEON T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/809,834	HUANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEON ANDREWS	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 December 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-32_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-32_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 December 2007_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed December 25, 2007 is acknowledged.

- **Claims 1-3, 6, 13-18, 20-21 and 29-32** were amended.

- **Claim 5** was cancelled.

- Specification was amended.

- Drawing, Fig. 4b was amended.

- Examiner's Rejection to **Claims 1-4 and 6-32** is not withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or

described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have

been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to

which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which

the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1 and 17** are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bell Labs Technical Journal in view of Mayer (Pub. No.: US 2005/0015499 A1).

Regarding Claims 1 and 17, Bell Labs Technical Journal teaches all the limitations of the claims. However, Bell Labs Technical Journal fails to specifically teach SIP response message received by S-CSCF according filter criteria.

Mayer teaches SIP request received is forwarded to S-CSCF and S-CSCF responds to SIP request per the event filter, page 3, lines 10-17.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Mayer's SIP response message received by S-SCCF according to filter criteria because this would have allowed communicating with any kind of multimedia system in which SIP signaling between the terminal and the multimedia enabling system is used, page 3, lines.3-5

Regarding Claims 1 and 17, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9) for IP multimedia service control (IMS service control, page 27, line 16), comprising:

recording (register request to application server by S-CSCF, column 1, page 32, lines 30-31) a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message (Fig. 3, SIP register message, column 1, page 32, line 17) received by a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) (Fig. 3, Serving CSCF, the message is forwarded to the appropriate S-CSCF, column 1, page 32, lines 22-23);

examining a corresponding SIP response message received by the S-CSSF according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC) (SIP request received is forwarded to S-CSCF (Fig. 2, 21, 22, page 3, lines 10-15) and S-CSCF responds to SIP request per the event filter, Fig. 2, 23, page 3,

lines 15-17), comprising specific responses triggering individual application services (Fig. 2, 24, local service configuration server provides a port, address and configuration information, page 3, lines 19-24) available from a service provider (Fig. 2, 24, local service configuration server, page 3, lines 19-20); and

reissuing the SIP request message (Figure 9, SIP INVITE) to an application server (Figure 9, CF AS) designated by the rFC (Figure 9, filter criteria, column 2, page 40, line 4) if the corresponding SIP response message (Figure 9, SIP 100) matches (Fig. 9, 9, filter criteria matches for AS) Service Point Triggers (SPTs) (application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines 23-25) of one of the rFC (Figure 9, UE is updated, a NOTIFY is sent to the application sever and, when a call comes in for the UE (steps 2-9) SIP INVITE is forwarded to the application server (reissued) based on the filter criteria which matched for AS, columns 2, 1 and 2, pages 39 and 40, lines 44-45, 1 and 1-4 respectively).

Regarding Claim 2, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses the triggering method according to claim 1, further comprising setting up a list of SPTs (upon receipt of a session initiation trigger, the application checks the availability of all conferees and set up accordingly, column 2, page 36, lines 1-3) of the rFC for matching the corresponding SIP response message.

Regarding Claims 3 and 18, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the SPTs of the rFC are defined by:

SIP response code (Fig. 9, Cx Response, SIP response messages, 200 OK, column 1,

page 41, lines 17-18);

an SIP method of the SIP request message (method of a SIP request, column 1, page 32,

line 43);

a content of a header field (content of a SIP header, column 2, page 32, lines 32-33) or

request-URI of the SIP request message; and

a direction of the SIP request message (Fig. 3, 4. Request).

Regarding Claims 4, 7, 19 and 22, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the S-CSCF

examines the SPTs of the rFC or iFC one by one according to their indicated priority (request

that is the output of the first application server is subject to the next highest priority filter criteria

and, if it satisfies these criteria, it is input to the corresponding second application server. This

process continues until all the different filter criteria priorities are considered or final response to

SIP request resulted, column 2, page 32, lines 42-45 and column 1, page 33, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claims 6 and 21, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), further comprising the

steps of:

examining the SIP request message received by the S-CSCF (S-CSCF sends a third-party

register request to each application server dedicated by the filter criteria, column 1, page 32, lines

30-32) according to a set of initial Filter Criteria (iFC) (set of initial criteria, column 1, page 32,

line 26); and

reissuing the SIP request message to the application server designated by the iFC if the

SIP request message matches (Figure 9, UE is updated, a NOTIFY is sent to the application

sever and, when a call comes in for the UE (steps 2-9) SIP INVITE is forwarded to the

application server (reissued) based on the filter criteria which matched for AS, columns 2, 1 and

2, pages 39 and 40, lines 44-45, 1 and 1-4 respectively) Service Point Triggers (SPTs)

(application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines

23-25) of one of the iFC (set of initial criteria, column 1, page 32, line 26).

Regarding Claims 8 and 24, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the rFC are

stored in a Home Subscriber Server (HSS) as part of the user profile (Fig. 3, HSS 5. Profile; HSS

is queried for the user's profile which includes filter criteria, column 1, page 32, lines 24-26).

Regarding Claims 9 and 25, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the rFC are

downloaded to the S-CSCF upon user registration (Fig. 3, registration process within S-CSCF

includes querying the HSS for the user's profile which includes filter criteria, column 1, page 32, lines 23-26).

Regarding Claims 10 and 26, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the application server is an SIP application server (SIP application server, page 27, line 15).

Regarding Claims 11 and 27, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the application server is an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Service Switching Function (IP-SSF) (IMS service control (ISC) on application server, page 27, lines 16-17).

Regarding Claims 12 and 28, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the application server is an Open Service Access (OSA) Service Capability Server (SCS) (Fig. 4, IMS application servers are represented by the SIP application server and the OSA gateway, column 2, page 33, line 26-28; within the IMS, access to OSA is offered through a gateway which is seen as a special case of a SIP application server, column 1, page 34, lines 3-5).

Regarding Claims 13 and 29, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the triggering

method is applied when the application servers are selected depending on a content of the

corresponding SIP response message (response to the SIP request resulted in the logic performed

in one of the application servers, column 1, page 33, lines 3-5).

Regarding Claims 14 and 30, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9) according to claim 13,

wherein the corresponding SIP response message represents a connection status is line busy

(rerouting decisions are based on criteria such as busy, column 1, page 39, lines 38-39).

Regarding Claims 15 and 31, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the

corresponding SIP response message represents a connection status of destination unreachable

(rerouting decisions are based on criteria such as no answer, column 1, page 39, lines 38-40) or

not found.

Regarding Claims 16 and 32, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method

(method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the

corresponding SIP response message represents a connection status of call setup failure (Fig. 9,

0. Notify, called party unavailable).

Regarding Claim 20, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses the Internet Protocol (IP)

multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9)

according to claim 17, wherein the S-CSCF records (Fig. 9, CF-AS, CF application server

updates its subscriber records, column 1, page 40, lines 3-5) the SIP request message (S-CSCF

adds an identifying indication to a request before forwarding it to an application server so that it

can identify the message that comes back from the application server, column 1, page 33, lines

14-17) to be reissued to the application server designated by the rFC when the corresponding SIP

response message (Fig. 9, SIP 100) matches (Fig. 9, 9, filter criteria matches for AS) the SPTs

(application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines

23-25) of one of the rFC (filter criteria, column 2, page 40, line 4).

Regarding Claim 23, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses the Internet Protocol (IP)

multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9)

according to claim 21, wherein the S-CSCF selectively disables the function of examining the

rFC (S-CSCF uses filter criteria to involve the application servers and the filtering is done on the

SIP message such as BYE, column 1, page 32, lines 37-40).

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

3.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

    Madour et al. (Pub No.: US 2004/0109459 A1) discloses packet filter provisioning to a

packet data access node.

    Trossen (Pub. No.: US 2004/0260819 A1) systems and methods for restricting event

subscriptions through proxy-based filtering.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed December 25, 2007 have been fully considered, but they are

not persuasive.

-         In the remarks on pages 16 and 17 of the amendment, applicant contends in

        claim 1, Bell Labs Technical Journal failed to disclose, teach, imply or

        suggest the 'examining a corresponding SIP response message received by the

        S-CSCF according to a set of rFC' and also, using 'serving call session control

        function' to carry out the triggering method   Thus, the rejection of claim 1

        should be withdrawn. Further, since independent claim 17 defines similar

        features to claim 1, rejection to claim 17 should be withdrawn. And, since

        claims 2-4, 6-16 depend on claim 1 and 18-32 depend on claim 17, the

        rejections to these claims should be withdrawn for the same reasons as claim

        1.

-       The examiner respectfully disagrees and contends that Mayer discloses SIP

request received is forwarded to S-CSCF (Fig. 2, 21, 22, page 3, lines 10-15)

and S-CSCF responds to SIP request per the event filter, Fig. 2, 23, page 3,

lines 15-17). Also, triggering individual application services whereby Fig. 2,

24, local service configuration server provides a port, address and

configuration information, page 3, lines 19-24). Thus, the rejection of claim 1

will not be withdrawn. Further, the rejections to independent claims 17, 2-4,

6-16 and 18-32 will not be withdrawn.

Conclusion

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Andrews whose telephone number is (571) 270-1801. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rao S. Seema can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Seema S. Rao/

Supervisory Patent Examiner,

Art Unit 2616

LA/la
July 19, 2007